UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,392	12/16/2003	Julia Y. Larikova	PB 01 0035	7630
	7590 02/14/200 CELLA (TELLABS)		EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFEL	LER PLAZA		NGUYEN, TUNG X	
NEW YORK, NY 10112-3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/737,392	LARIKOVA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	TUNG X. NGUYEN	2829
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinded will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 №</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 6-10,21,22,26,27 and 35-45 is/are possible 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, 35-45 is/are rejected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	awn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Pority documents have been receive Tau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/737,392 Page 2

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leas et al. (u.s.p 5,600,257 heretoafter Leas), in view of Ishikawa (u.s.p 4,891,577)

As to claims 6, 8, 40 Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, a method for testing a component semiconductor, the method comprising steps of:

Providing a golden electrical component (32) that generates signals having known characteristic;

Removably connecting the component (DUT 34) to a probe (21);

Removably connecting the probe (54) to the golden electrical component (32);

Transmitting a electrical signal from the golden electrical component (32) to the component (DUT 34); and

Identifying a response by the component to the electrical signal (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Figs. 1-2).

Adjusting the electrical signal (via 140).

Leas is silent about the high-frequency probe for testing the DUT, wherein the DUT is the optical component.

Application/Control Number: 10/737,392 Page 3

Art Unit: 2829

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Chan, and replace the high-frequency probe, as taught by Ishikawa for contacting the device under test to transmit high frequency signals.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the DUT including the optical component.

As to claims 7, 43, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, evaluating the response by optical component (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Fig. 1).

As to claims 9, 41, 44, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, evaluating (via 58) of the response by the optical component comprises determining if the optical component responds in substantially the same manner as a golden optical component would respond to a substantially equivalent electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-2).

As to claims 10, 42, 45, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the evaluating (via 58) of the response by the optical component comprises comparing the response by the optical component to a response by a golden optical component to a substantially equivalent electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-2).

As to claims 21-22, 39, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, identifying (evaluating 58) a response by the optical component to the adjusted electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-5).

Application/Control Number: 10/737,392

Art Unit: 2829

As to claim 26, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the providing of a golden electrical component (32) comprises providing an electrical component (140) that operates according to product application requirements (34).

As to claims 27, 35 Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the golden electrical component (32) is located on an application PCB (90).

As to claim 36, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the golden electrical component is a golden PCB (90) having at least one component (32) that generates signals having known characteristics.

As to claims 37-38, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the method comprising the steps of providing a golden printed circuit board having golden components that generate signals having know characteristic;

Removably connecting the component (DUT 34) to a probe (21);

Removably connecting the probe (54) to the golden PCB (90);

Transmitting a electrical signal from the golden PCB (90) to the component (DUT 34); and

Identifying a response by the component to the electrical signal (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Figs. 1-2).

Adjusting the electrical signal (via 140).

Leas is silent about the high-frequency probe for testing the DUT, wherein the DUT is the optical component.

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Chan, and replace the high-

frequency probe, as taught by Ishikawa for contacting the device under test to transmit high frequency signals.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the DUT including the optical component.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, 35-45 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUNG X. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/737,392 Page 6

Art Unit: 2829

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN 1/31/08

/Ha T. Nguyen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2829